



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/032,863 03/02/98 GRIGOR

G 0100.01117

EXAMINER

WM02/0307

JOHN R. GARRETT
MARKINSON & RECKAMP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 06229
WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO IL 60606-0229

NGUYEN, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED:

03/07/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/032,863

Applicant(s)

GRIGOR ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 17-19, 21-24, 29-33 and 38-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 17-19, 21-24, 29-33 and 38-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 9/29/2000 is entered. However, Claims 14, 17-19, 21-24, 29-33 and 38-48 have been rejected in view of the newly discovered prior arts of Caine (5,361,078) and Odryna et al. (6,104,414) below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 14, 17-19, 21-24, 29-33 and 38-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caine in view of Odryna et al.

4. As to claims 14, 17-19 and 21-23, Caine teaches a display card 50 (figure 2), co-processor 34 (display controller), the four SRAMs 22A to 22D (a plurality of screen memory) are assigned to four video channels and connected to four corresponding video drivers 24A to 24D (col. 2, lines 53-55), the status register 36 corresponding to the claimed a coupling controller (col. 3, lines 7-11), in the embodiment described, the status register 36 is common to all channels and is moreover at the same address on all boards so all 24 channels are treated identically so far as the status register bits are concerned. Obviously, the six boards could have separately addressed status registers and, on any given board, there could be separately addressed status registers for each channel. Regardless of such considerations, it will be appreciated that the number of images stored, how they are sequenced and whether and how the displayed information

on the screws relates from screen to screen are all under control of the host computer, more especially via the status register or registers 36 (col. 6, lines 8-21). Therefore, Caine teaches all the claimed limitations of claim 14, except for a plurality of display controllers.

However, Odryna et al. teaches a related multiple display system in which two of the frame buffer 26 are disposed on a first circuit card within the hub 20. Two further buffers 26 are located on a separate circuit card, also within the hub 20 corresponding to the claimed a plurality of display controller (fig. 3, col. 4, lines 65-67A). It would have been obvious to utilize a plurality of frame buffer 26 taught by Odryna et al. for co-processor 34 in the multiple display of Caine's system because this would allow the user to use a plurality of display controller taught by Odryna et al. more complicated than one display controller taught by Caine.

5. As to claims 24 and 29-32, Caine teaches a host computer 10 and a keyboard 12 corresponding to the claimed a processing unit (col. 3, lines 1-6) to (a) receive display preferences regarding at least one of a multiple displays; (b) determine whether the display preferences can be fulfilled in observance of at least one of : configurationfulfilled; and (c) configure the computing systemwhen the current configuration can be reconfigured. Regardless of such considerations, it will be appreciated that the number of images stored, how they are sequenced and whether and how the displayed information on the screws relates from screen to screen are all under control of the host computer, more especially via the status register or registers 36 (col. 6, lines 16-21).

6. As to claims 33 and 38-41, Caine teaches a host computer 10 including internal memory and hard drive and floppy disc corresponding to the claimed a digital storage medium for storing programming instructions of first means, second means, third means and fourth means (col. 2, lines 21-24).

7. As to claims 42-48, refer to the previous rejections as applied to claims 14, 17-19 and 21-23.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 14, 17-19, 21-24, 29-33 and 38-48, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-6209. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 9:00-5:00 with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A Hjerpe can be reached on 703-305-4709. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-6606 for regular communications and 703-308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Application/Control Number: 09/032,863

Page 5

Art Unit: 2674

Kevin M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

KN
March 1, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hjerpe', written over the printed name.

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600